

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
CHARLOTTE DIVISION  
3:19-cv-485-RJC-DCK

JOANN McCULLOUGH,

Plaintiff,

v.

INTEGRITY AUTOMOTIVE  
PROMOTIONS, LLC, GROW FINANCIAL  
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION, and  
GRASSROOTS ASSOCIATES, INC., d/b/a  
Kia of Gastonia,

Defendants.

**ORDER**

**THIS MATTER** comes before the Court on Defendant Integrity Automotive Promotions, LLC's Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint (Doc. No. 36); Defendant Grow Financial Federal Credit Union's Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint (Doc. No. 38); Defendant Grassroots Associates, Inc. d/b/a Kia of Gastonia's Amended Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint and to Compel Arbitration (Doc. No. 40); Plaintiff's Motion to Remand (Doc. No. 45).; and the Magistrate Judge's Memorandum and Recommendation ("M&R"), (Doc. No. 54) recommending that the defendants' motions should be granted in part and denied in part. The parties have not filed objections to the M&R and the time for doing so has expired. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2).

## **I. BACKGROUND**

No party has objected to the Magistrate Judge's statement of the factual and procedural background of this case. Therefore, the Court adopts the facts as set forth in the M&R.

## **II. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

A district court may assign dispositive pretrial matters, including motions to dismiss, to a magistrate judge for "proposed findings of fact and recommendations." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) & (B). The Federal Magistrate Act provides that a district court "shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." Id. § 636(b)(1)(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). However, "when objections to strictly legal issues are raised and no factual issues are challenged, de novo review of the record may be dispensed with." Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). De novo review is also not required "when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." Id. Similarly, when no timely objection is filed, "a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, advisory committee note).

## **III. DISCUSSION**

Under Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a district court judge

shall make a de novo determination of any portion of an M&R to which specific written objection has been made. A party's failure to make a timely objection is accepted as an agreement with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. See Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985). No objection to the M&R having been filed, and the time for doing so having passed, the parties have waived their right to de novo review of any issue covered in the M&R. Nevertheless, this Court has conducted a full review of the M&R and other documents of record and, having done so, hereby finds that the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is, in all respects, in accordance with the law and should be approved. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as its own.

#### IV. CONCLUSION


**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that:

1. The Magistrate Judge's M&R, (Doc. No. 54), is **ADOPTED**;
2. Defendant Integrity Automotive Promotions, LLC's Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint, (Doc. No. 36), is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**;
3. Defendant Grow Financial Federal Credit Union's Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint, (Doc. No. 38), is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**;
4. Defendant Grassroots Associates, Inc. d/b/a/ Kia of Gastonia's Amended Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint and to Compel Arbitration, (Doc. No. 40), is **GRANTED in part and the parties shall be COMPELLED to pursue arbitration** as discussed in the Magistrate Judge's M&R (Doc. No. 54);

5. Plaintiff's Motion to Remand, (Doc. No. 45), is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**; and
6. This matter will be **STAYED** pending arbitration, and the parties shall be required to file a joint Status Report in ninety (90) days, and every ninety (90) days thereafter, until otherwise ordered by the Court.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed: September 30, 2020

  
Robert J. Conrad, Jr.  
United States District Judge

